

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 10, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 3, 8, 11, 14 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections and objections in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The specification was objected to for the reasons set forth on pages 2-4 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended the specification to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,232 to Kroeker et al, for the reasons set forth on pages 4-9 of the Office Action.

Claims 1, 10 and 13 are believed to be patentably distinct and patentable over Kroeker since, at the very minimum, Kroeker does not disclose or suggest *preloading compressed boot data or compressed application data into cache and servicing requests for boot/application data by decompressing the preloaded data*, as essentially claims in claims 1, 10, and/or 13. Indeed, even Examiner acknowledges on Page 9 of the Office Action that Kroeker does not disclose compressing/decompressing data. Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 11 and 16 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kroeker in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,173,381 to Dye. Claims 8, 11 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice and thus, the specific rejection is moot. However, Applicants will address the rejection with regard to amended claims 1, 10 and 13.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, various criteria must be met. For instance, the cited references *must* teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Further, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art to combine their teachings. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure (see, e.g., MPEP 2141, 2143, 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kroeker and Dye does not render claims 1, 10 or 13 obvious. For example, Applicants submit that such combination does not fairly teach or *suggest preloading compressed boot data or compressed application into a cache memory device and decompressing the preloaded compressed data to service requests for such data from the host system.*

Although Dye arguably discloses a data controller having compression/decompression functions, it is submitted that other than through hindsight knowledge gleaned from Applicants' specification, there would be no motivation to combine data compression taught by Dye into the Kroeker system to derive the claimed inventions. Indeed, Dye discloses (Col. 11, lines 59-66, for example) a protocol whereby compressed data is accessed, decompressed and then stored in system memory. In contrast, with the claimed inventions, compressed boot/application data is first accessed and preloaded into a cache, and then decompressed to service requests for such data by the host system. These steps are not disclosed by either Dye or Kroecker.

The claimed inventions provide an advantage over the Kroecker system in terms of

accelerated processing. For example, with respect to accelerated booting, more acceleration could be obtained by accessing and storing the compressed data before decompressing to service requests. Indeed, a significant amount of boot data (in compressed form) can be quickly accessed and stored in cache (fast access memory) prior to commencement of the boot process. Thereafter, when requested by the host system, the compressed data is readily accessible (short access time) and can be decompressed in real-time to service such requests.

In contrast, if the boot data was first compressed before preloaded into cache (e.g., Kroeker modified by the teachings of Dye (Col. 11, lines 60-66), less acceleration would be obtained because, e.g., the time for decompressing the boot data upon access from the boot device could add latency preventing more data from being accessed from the boot device before commencement of the boot process. In such case, if system requests for boot data must be serviced by first accessing compressed data from the boot device, the added latency in accessing compressed data from hard disk or other boot device (as opposed to cache) could slow the system. For at least these reasons, it is believed that the combination of Kroeker and Dye would not reasonable disclose, suggest or render obvious, claims 1, 10 or 13.

Early and favorable consideration by the Examiner is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any

remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889